

**Remarks**

This paper is a response to the non-final Office action electronically delivered with a Notification Date of July 18, 2007. The action establishes a shortened three month period for response. The paper is being filed well within the established period.

The Office action, in Paragraph 2, objected to original claim 8 as having a typographical error and to original claim 9 as attempting to make a hardware claim based on a software prefix. Both of these objections are considered mooted by the cancellation of claims 8 and 9 and will not be discussed further.

The Office action, in Paragraph 3, rejected original claims 10 and 11 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. This rejection is mooted by the cancellation of these claims and will not be discussed further.

The Office action, in Paragraph 4, rejected original claims 1-4 and 8-11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication 2006/00115854 A1 to Muhlestein et al. The rejection is mooted by the cancellation of these claims and will not be discussed further.

The Office action, in Paragraph 10, objected to original claims 5-7 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitation of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 5-7 have been cancelled and are replaced by new claims 12-14. New claim 12 is an independent claim that is intended to have the same scope as original claim 5. New claim 13 is dependent on claim 12 and is intended to have the same scope as original claim 6. New claim 14 is dependent on claim 13 and is intended to have the same scope as original claim 7. New claims 12-14 are allowable for the same reasons original 5-7 were considered allowable if rewritten to avoid the dependency on a rejected base claim.

New claims 15-17 are program product claims that correspond to the new method claims 12-14 and are allowable for the same reasons as those claims.

New claims 18-20 are infrastructure or apparatus claims that correspond to the method claims 12-14 and are allowable for the same reasons as those claims.

It is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue containing claims 12-20 as set forth herein.

Respectfully Submitted,

/Gerald R. Woods/

Gerald R. Woods, Reg. 24,144  
(919) 554-0993